

1106 Pine Street  
 N/mo 24th 1885

Dear Mr. Fox  
 Esteemed Friend.

I have observed that the Mint Cabinet has latterly received quite an accession, in the case containing patterns, of pieces struck in Copper, that were designed for Gold or Silver Coins, only; such as a \$50 gold piece & dollars, half dollars &c. For many years I have seen such experimental pieces, that had been struck in the Mint, not only in Copper, but also in Aluminium, and nickel alloys.

The explanation that I have heard given for this remarkable issue, has been that they were made to try the dies. This is doubtless true in some cases, but will not

explain the large number of  
 some of them. Suppose at some  
 remote period in the future,  
 these pieces should be seen.

Would they not falsify history  
 and suggest a corrupt state of  
 the Criminal branch of the  
 Government, that ~~we~~ known does  
 not exist? For it would not  
 be difficult to prove that they  
 were made by the Government ~~don't~~

There is no necessity for the  
 preservation of any such pieces.  
 May I now therefore suggest,  
 that hereafter all trial pieces  
 in metals not intended or allowed  
 by law to be issued, shall be  
 destroyed, as soon as the die  
 sinker and Coin shall be satis-  
 fied of the perfection of the die?  
 I am with much respect  
 E. M. Davis.



## Mint of the United States at Philadelphia,

November 1, 1884-

Sir.

Our Cabinet contain many specimens of pattern coins of inferior metal to that in which it was intended to be issued, and many others in their in their own proper metal. There are also many very rare patterns, in false metal, owned by outside parties, which are not represented in the Cabinet.

I think that all coins of Copper or other soft metal, which are struck to prove the dies, should be destroyed immediately after the trial, and patterns if struck to be sold, should be in the same metal in which the coin was intended to be issued. And either a sufficient number struck to supply



## Mint of the United States at Philadelphia,

, 188 .

all who desire them, at a fair price, or none.

I would suggest that the word "pattern" be stamped or engraved on all patterns to distinguish them from the coins of the regular issue.

Patterns are historically interesting as mementoes of what might have occurred but did not. And in addition to regular issue as specimens of the art of Coining in the different periods of history.

I know of patterns, as far back as Edward I. of England, A. D. 1272-1307. We have a beautiful pattern fine - Sovereign piece (gold) of George IV. 1826. A number of patterns were struck in



## Mint of the United States at Philadelphia,

, 188 .

1792, for our national coinage, the  
disme (dime) was struck in silver and  
copper. Two specimens of the latter are  
in our Cabinet.

R. A. McClure  
Curator  
of Cabinet.

Hon. Daniel M. Fox,  
Superintendent.

Coin - Maria  
to S. Miat.  
Phila. Pa.  
Nov. 1. 1885.

R. A. McClure.  
Curator.

Relative to Pattern Pieces  
Encloses Dr. Maria's  
Letter.

Recd. Nov 1. 1885 -

[Letter One:]

1106 Pine Street  
November 24, 1885

Daniel M. Fox

Esteemed Friend.

I have observed that the Mint Cabinet has latterly received quite an accession, in the case containing patterns, of pieces struck in copper, that were designed for Gold or Silver Coins only; such as a \$50 gold piece & dollars, half dollars &c. For many years I have seen such experimental pieces, that had been struck in the Mint, not only in copper, but also in aluminum and nickel alloys.

The explanation that I have heard given for this remarkable issue has been that they were made to try the dies. This is doubtless true in some cases, but will not explain the large number of some of them. Suppose at some remote period in the future these pieces should be seen? Would they not falsify history and suggest a corrupt state of the Coining branch of the Government, that we know does not exist? For it could not be difficult to prove that they were made by the Government die.

There is no necessity for the preservation of any such pieces. May I now therefore suggest that hereafter all trial pieces in metals not intended or allowed by law to be issued shall be destroyed, as soon as the die sinker and coiner shall be satisfied of the perfection of the die?

I am with much respect,  
E. Maris.

[Letter Two:]

[Abstract:] Relative to Pattern Pieces, Encloses Dr. Maris' letter.

Mint of the United States at Philadelphia,  
November 1, 1885

Sir,

Our Cabinet contain many specimen of pattern coins of inferior metal to that in which it was intended to be issued. And many others in their in their own proper metal. There are also many very rare patterns, in false metal, owned by outside parties, which are not represented in the Cabinet.

I think that all coins of copper or other soft metal, which are struck to prove the dies, should be destroyed immediately after the trial, and patterns if struck to be sold, should be in the same metal in which the coin was intended to be issued. And either a sufficient number struck to supply all who desire them, at a fair price, or none.

I would suggest that the word "pattern" be stamped or engraved on all patterns to distinguish them from the coins of the regular issue.

Patterns are historically interesting as mementoes of what might have occurred but did not. And in addition to regular issue as specimens of the art of coining in the different periods of history.

I know of patterns, as far back as Edward I of England, A.D. 1272-1307. We have a beautiful pattern fine -sovereign piece (gold) of George IV, 1826. A number of patterns were struck in 1792, for our national coinage, the disme (dime) was struck in silver and copper, two specimens of the latter are in our Cabinet.

R.A. McClure  
Curator of Cabinet.

Hon. Daniel M. Fox,  
Superintendent.